

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Final Office Action mailed September 11, 2003. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 14 remain pending. In particular, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 12 – 14, and has canceled claims 15 and 16 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant has canceled claims 15 and 16 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Terminal Disclaimer

The Office Action indicates that the terminal disclaimer filed on July 11, 2003 is not accepted because the application is improperly identified in the terminal disclaimer. Furthermore, the Office Action indicates that an attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer. In this regard, Applicant submits herewith a timely-filed terminal disclaimer, signed by an attorney of record, which complies with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) and properly identifies the present application.

The statutory terminal disclaimer fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.20(d) was previously paid by deposit account for the non-accepted terminal disclaimer filed July 11, 2003. Thus, no fee is believed to be due for the terminal disclaimer filed herein. However, any fees deemed to be required are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 20-0778 under 37 C.F.R 1.25.

II. Double Patenting

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 16 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,028,522. In this regard, in light of the terminal disclaimer submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully asserts that the double-patenting rejection is moot.

III. Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the time Examiner Nghiem spent with Applicant’s attorney, Christopher Guinn, during a telephone discussion on October 8, 2003 regarding the outstanding Office Action (paper no. 6). During the interview, Applicant’s attorney made proposed amendments to claims 1, 10, 12, 13, and 14 which the Examiner indicated would overcome U.S. Patent 5,471,201 to Cerami, *et al.* Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 12, 13, and 14 in accordance with the proposed amendments and, as such, submits that independent claims 1, 12, 13, and 14, and dependent claims 2 – 11, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

IV. Claims 1-14 are Patentable Over Cerami

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,471,201 to Cerami, *et al.* (“Cerami”). Furthermore, claim 10 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten to include all the features of its corresponding base claim.

However, Cerami fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1-14 as discussed in the Examiner Interview of October 8, 2003. For example, independent claim 1 contains the element of “**a wide-area network** that allows access to the central system,” and independent claims 12, 13, and 14 include the element of “accessing the central system via a **wide-area network.**” Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1 – 14 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure
Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
100 Galleria Parkway N.W., Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500